DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 692 UD 009 444

TITLE	How ESEA Title II Meets the Educational Needs of Poor Children. A Special Report.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 69
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45
DESCRIPTORS	Culturally Disadvantaged, Economically Disadvantaged, Educational Administration, Educational Finance, *Educational Needs, *Educational Resources, Elementary School Students, Inservice Education, Inservice Teacher Education, *Instructional Materials, *Resource Allocations, Secondary School Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title II, ESEA Title II Programs, Office of Education

ABSTRACT

This report details the contributions made by ESEA Title II programs toward providing poor children with increased quantities of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Formal and informal efforts made to assist teachers and media specialists in learning to select and utilize those materials most meaningful to educationally and economically deprived children are described. Demonstrations of media programs especially designed for the disadvantaged, as shown to school and lay personnel, are also outlined. Three tables appended bear on the number of children participating in ESEA Title I and those benefiting from Title II in the fiscal years 1966, 1967 and 1968, by region and State; percentage of Title II funds distributed on a per capita basis in the fiscal years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969, by region and State; and, the amount of Title II funds expended on special-purpose grant projects in the fiscal years 1966, 1967 and 1968, by region and State. (PJ)

ED035692

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NOV 26 1969

09444 E

A SPECIAL REPORT

HOW ESEA TITLE II MEETS THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF POOR CHILDREN

FEBRUARY 1969

UD 009444

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Poor Children--ESEA Title II Program Participation	2
Allocation of Materials According to Relative Need	2
Selection of Materials	7
Inservice Education	10
Provision of Free Textbooks	13
Plans for the Future	17
Summary	20
Appendix	21
Table I. Number of Children Participating in ESEA Title I and Those Also Benefiting from ESEA Title II, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968, by Region and State	22
Table II. Percent of ESEA Title II Funds Distributed on a Per Capita Basis, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, by Region and State	24
Table III. Amount of ESEA Title II Funds Used in Special-Purpose Grant Projects, Number of Grants Serving Poor Children, Number of Children Served by These Grants, and Amount of Special-Purpose Grant Funds Expended for Poor Children, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968, by Region and State	25

INTRODUCTION

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act aims to give children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools greater access to a larger quantity of instructional materials of high quality. Under Title II, direct grants of Federal funds have been made to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the U.S. Department of the Interior (for children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children). Participation by States, outlying areas, and the Department of the Interior is based on a plan approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education which serves as the contract or agreement between the State, area, or Department and the U.S. Office of Education.

Funds under Title II have been used for the acquisition, cataloging, processing, and delivery of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials suitable for use by children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. They have also defrayed State and local administrative costs incurred as a direct result of the administration of the Title II plan.

This report presents an analysis of the extent to which ESEA Title II has contributed to meeting the educational needs of poor children. Throughout the report, the criterion of poverty used is that specified by ESEA Title I, a program providing Federal financial assistance to schools serving areas with concentrations of children from families with annual incomes of $2,000 or less.

POOR CHILDREN--ESEA TITLE II PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table I shows the number of children who participated in ESEA Title I and those who also were served by ESEA Title II in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968. In the first 2 years, up to 84 percent of the children participating in Title I programs also benefited from Title II. While it cannot be assumed that all children assisted by both ESEA Titles I and II are severely economically disadvantaged, dual participation indicates that funds are being targeted toward the educationally deprived.

ALLOCATION OF MATERIALS ACCORDING TO RELATIVE NEED

ESEA Title II provides that the State plan shall set forth criteria for the allocation of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials on the basis of the relative need of the children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Title II Regulations (Section 117.3) require that the criteria establish, on the basis of a comparative analysis and the application of standards, the relative need of children and teachers for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials. The criteria shall include priorities for the provision of such materials on the basis of several factors, such as:

Requirements of elementary and secondary education

Quality and quantity of materials now available

Requirements of children and teachers in special or exemplary instructional programs

Cultural or linguistic needs of children and teachers

Degree of economic need

Degree of previous and current financial efforts to provide materials in relation to financial ability.

The States have used a variety of formulas for allocating materials among eligible children and teachers. Needs for materials in local schools have been evaluated from time to time by State departments of education and relative-need formulas adjusted accordingly. The criteria used have frequently given emphasis to serving the needs of poor children, as these children generally attend schools not well provided with materials.

Per Capita Basis and Title I Formula

In a number of States, the relative-need criterion used for the allocation of materials among the children and teachers of the State allows some materials to be divided on a per capita basis. This method of allocation provides that a proportion of materials shall be distributed equally among all eligible children, with the remaining materials distributed according to other need factors. In these States, therefore, all poor children were eligible for some benefits from Title II. (It is not known whether materials actually were made available to them.) Table II shows the percent of Title II funds allocated on a per capita basis for 4 fiscal years. These percentages should be studied in relation to figures in Table I.

Poor children in States using some per capita distribution also benefited to a greater extent than children from higher-income homes if in these same States relative-need formulas emphasize such factors

as the quantity of materials available in relation to standards, degree of economic need, requirements of children in special or exemplary instructional programs, and degrees of previous and current financial efforts for providing materials in relation to financial ability.

Four States used the ESEA Title I formula in making allotments under Title II. Alabama based its entire ESEA Title II allotment on the Title I formula in FY 1966 and FY 1967. Florida and South Carolina distributed 50 percent of the Title II acquisition funds under the Title I formula for the first 2 fiscal years. Michigan allocated in FY 1968, and will again in FY 1969, 35 percent of Title II acquisition funds for the use of children and teachers in schools with a concentration of 20 percent or more children identified as coming from families with $2,000 or less income, from homeswith mothers receiving Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) assistance, and from foster homes.

Special-Purpose Grants

For children and teachers in special or exemplary instructional programs, several States have included in their relative-need formulas, provision for the development of a selected number of model public school libraries or media centers to demonstrate good media programs, or for a number of special-purpose grants to provide instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in special instructional programs. In the first 3 years of the program, there have been over 1,000 of these projects in 32 States.

Table III provides data on the total expenditures for special-purpose grants under Title II for 3 fiscal years, the number of grants serving poor children, the number of poor children served by the grants, and the

total ESEA Title II expenditure for special-purpose programs serving poor children. Of the $20 million expended for special-purpose grants under Title II, approximately $10.5 million, or over 52 percent, was expended for 991 programs serving nearly 3 million children from low-income families.

The New York State Department of Education has estimated that 620,066 educationally and economically disadvantaged children participated in its basic ESEA Title II program, with an additional 458,555 participating in the special-purpose grant program. It is estimated that $1.7 million was expended for materials in the special-purpose grant programs serving such children.

Alabama began its Title II demonstration program in FY 1968, with five out of six of the grants serving children from low-income families.

In Nebraska, a special-purpose grant of $31,323 was made to 538 children and their teachers in Park Elementary School, Lincoln. This school serves an ethnically mixed area of the city.

Ohio funded a number of special-purpose grants serving educationally and economically disadvantaged children; however, four projects were directly aimed at instructional programs for such pupils. These projects involved 1,361 pupils, with over $111,663 expended for school library resources for their use.

Other Relative-Need Factors

There are eight States where the relative-need formulas appear to give unusual consideration to the needs of poor children for instructional materials. For example, in Connecticut, an ability-to-pay factor,

determined by the number of families in each school district who received an annual income of $4,000 or less, is one criterion used in the allocation of Title II funds. In New York, school districts are charged with the responsibility of allocating materials to children in schools with the greatest need Criteria relating to adequate staff, facilities, and equipment for media programs encourage local school districts to utilize Title II materials in schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged students where coordination with ESEA Title I funds would create optimum conditions for equalization of instruction.

The three factors used in the relative-need formula in Virginia--number of books per child, local expenditure for library materials per child, and locally taxable wealth per child--tend to favor children from low-income families. The relative-need formula used in Indiana favors poor children, as the State plan provides that schools ranking in the 4th quartile (least tax effort per ability) receive no allocation. The Michigan formula puts a high percentage of the Title II funds into 64 public school districts which contain a majority of disadvantaged students. Also within these districts, materials are used in the schools with the highest concentration of disadvantaged pupils. Such cities in Kansas as Wichita, Topeka, and Great Bend provided library equipment and professional staff in target schools with Title I funds, resulting in higher allocation of materials to these schools under Title II. In a few cases, use of Title I funds for staff and equipment made it possible for a target school to qualify for a Title II special-purpose grant.

The relative-need formula in California tends to benefit poor children more than others because the relative-need index is based on district assessed valuation, number of books in the district, and the tax rate of the district compared to the State average in these three areas. Weighted factors based on district effort and financial need, the program by which the materials are made available, and the need for use of materials strongly indicate that poor children in Oregon received more benefit under the Title II program than children from higher-income homes.

SELECTION OF MATERIALS

In Section 3.4 of the ESEA Title II State plans, the State agency administering the plan sets forth the criteria for selection of the school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials to be provided under the plan. Consideration is given to relating materials to curriculum and educational levels of pupils; reliance on the competencies of media specialists and teachers in the selection process; use of standard selection tools and reviewing media; and, to the extent possible, the examination and evaluation of materials by media specialists, teachers, and other school personnel.

In developing criteria for the selection of materials, many State plans have referred to the principles incorporated in the school library Bill of Rights[1/] which asserts that it is the responsibility of the school media center to:

1/ American Association of School Librarians. Standards for School Programs. Chicago: American Library Association, 1960. p. 75.

* Provide materials that will enrich and support the curriculum, taking into consideration the varied interests, abilities, and maturity levels of the pupils served.
* Provide materials representative of the many religious, ethnic, and cultural groups and their contributions to our American heritage.
* Place principle above personal opinion and reason above prejudice in the selection of materials of the highest quality in order to assure a comprehensive collection appropriate for the users of the library.

Under the ESEA Title II program, State departments of education have stressed the critical evaluation of materials. Special bibliographies have been developed and disseminated to local education agencies. Centers have been established where model collections of printed and audiovisual materials are available for examination by school personnel, who may also receive guidance in the selection of materials to be purchased or borrowed by their schools.

Many State departments of education have made special efforts under the Title II program to encourage the selection of printed and audiovisual materials especially suited to the needs of educationally and culturally deprived children, and of materials which treat all ethnic groups with fairness. The following examples illustrate the kinds of action taken:

* California reported that the ESEA Title II project applications (composites of requests for materials for the use of children and teachers in the eligible public and private schools within a district) include data on the extent to which the needs of special groups of children such as ethnic groups or educationally and culturally deprived children have been considered in making the request.

* In Kansas special reprint bibliographies were distributed to local education agencies, including lists with such titles as The American Negro in Contemporary Society, A Bibliography of Children's Books in Spanish or Spanish and English, and Non-Book Materials for Have-Not Youth.

* Two local education agencies in Maryland have developed special bibliographies which are available to other local education agencies. School personnel in Baltimore City compiled a list entitled "The Negro in American History." The list compiled in Baltimore County was "Materials of High-Interest and Low Readability."

* The examination center at the Mississippi State Department of Education, which was established under Titles II and V of ESEA, has been used extensively by teachers of educationally deprived children in the selection of instructional materials. The center is stocked with many types of low-vocabulary, high-interest material.

* The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction has prepared a comprehensive bibliography of selection aids which has special selections devoted to materials on brotherhood and Negro culture, and materials for use with poor readers.
* In South Carolina a special list of materials about Negroes and by Negro authors was compiled in 1966 and mailed to all districts in the State. The list is updated from time to time.
* In the Virgin Islands materials on people of the Caribbean, on the history of Africa, and multi-ethnic materials are available from the ESEA Title II center.

INSERVICE EDUCATION

Section 3.22 of the ESEA Title II State plans describes the program of State administration, leadership, and supervision, giving a brief description of the types of services to be provided to the local education agencies by the State agency in the way of leadership and inservice education activities. Statewide information conferences, inservice programs, and consultative services have been among the general activities carried on.

In a number of States, special efforts have been made to provide inservice education in the selection and use of instructional materials for school personnel working with children from low-income families. The scope of inservice education for such school personnel is illustrated by the following:

* In Alabama during the summers of 1967 and 1968, four workshops were conducted by the Title II staff in cooperation with Title I.

Each workshop included a large number of participants who worked primarily with children of low-income families.

* In the District of Columbia sample copies of books for special groups, such as Spanish-American children, have been made available at inservice meetings.
* Buchner Elementary School in Wichita, one of the Title II demonstration schools in Kansas, is working in an inservice capacity with Title I schools in the area. Buchner is presently carrying out an experimental project in media therapy.

* Mississippi reports that ESEA Title II personnel have provided consultative services to Title I Target Area Schools through conferences, workshops, and school visits.
* In 1968, the Maryland State Department of Education held an inservice workshop devoted to the selection of materials for poor and reluctant readers.
* The New York State Education Agency conducted a workshop on the development of media programs for the educationally handicapped and the educationally deprived.
* Oregon has directed summer school programs and summer inservice training to needs of migrant children and bilingual children.

* In South Carolina over 600 untrained librarians (teachers who volunteered to staff new libraries established for disadvantaged children with Title I and Title II funds) have attended summer schools for training in library work. These summer sessions were financed with Title I funds and the participants agreed to attend four 6-hour summer sessions to secure certification.
* Texas Education Agency consultants in educational media have participated in Title I and migrant programs, advising on special materials for school personnel who work with these children.
* In the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands much effort has gone into the selection of instructional materials used in the teaching of English as a second language. This has involved the participation of linguists and teachers from all parts of the Trust Territory. Although the programs were not funded under ESEA, participants were school personnel who would select and use materials acquired under the Title II program.
* In Wisconsin direct contact was made in a series of visits in the city of Milwaukee. Visits were made to 35 schools and the selection of materials for special groups was among the topics discussed.

PROVISION OF FREE TEXTBOOKS

The pattern for the provision of free textbooks to children, by either the State or the school district, varies. In some States, free textbooks are provided for all public school children; in others, for public elementary school children only. In a few States, all public school children must either buy or rent their textbooks. The laws of seven States--Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island--permit or provide for the distribution of textbooks to children in private schools. Illinois reports that some local school boards may have taken action to furnish textbooks to private school children.

Under the ESEA Title II program, on an average, 28 States and areas for each of 4 fiscal years have permitted the loan of textbooks to public and private school children. However, only Puerto Rico permitted more than 25 percent of the Title II acquisition funds to be expended for textbooks in any year. In justifying the low priority given to textbooks in State plans, the State departments of education indicated that textbooks were in more adequate supply than school library resources and other instructional materials. Approximately $9 million has been expended under the ESEA Title II program to provide about 4.1 million textbooks during the 3 years the program has been in operation.

Data on the provision of free textbooks to public school children are presented below by region. No information on quality and recency of textbooks was obtained. There is evidence from observation that some school districts have poor and outmoded textbooks.

Region I

Free textbooks are provided for the use of elementary and secondary public school children, either by the State or by the local school district in all States in the region--Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Region II

In the States in Region II--Delaware, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania--free textbooks are provided by either the State or the local school district for the use of public school children.

Region III

In five of the eight States and outlying areas in Region III, free textbooks are provided for public school children, either by the State or by the local school district. These include the District of Columbia, Maryland, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

In Kentucky, free textbooks are issued to public elementary school children. Children in grades 9-12 buy their own books. The ESEA Title II program has provided textbooks for indigent children.

Virginia has no statewide policy regarding free textbooks for public school children except for the indigent. No Title II funds have been expended for textbooks in Virginia.

All counties in West Virginia receive funds from the State legislature with which to provide textbooks for the indigent; other children must purchase their own textbooks. No Title II funds were used in West Virginia to provide textbooks in FY 1966; however, in FY 1967, approximately $53,624 was expended for textbooks.

Region IV

In Region IV, public school children in five of the six States--Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee--are supplied with free textbooks, either by the State or by the local school district. South Carolina provides free textbooks for grades 1-8. No textbooks have been purchased with Title II funds in South Carolina.

Region V

In Region V, free textbooks are provided by either the State or by the school district for the use of public school children in Indiana and Ohio. About 60 percent of the public school children in Illinois are in school districts where free textbooks are not provided; those in the city of Chicago do receive them. The furnishing of free textbooks in Illinois is permissive by statute and approval by local voters.

In Michigan, the plan for free textbooks varies by school district. In this State some districts provide textbooks for all public school children, others for elementary public school children only, and some not at all. Michigan purchased 17,492 textbooks under the Title II program in FY 1966. In FY 1967, approximately $257,938 was expended to provide 47,774 textbooks.

It is estimated that about 5 percent of Wisconsin public school children are provided with free textbooks. During the first 2 years of the Title II program, about $99,205 was expended for 29,100 textbooks loaned to Wisconsin school children.

Region VI

Of the States in Region VI, Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota provide their public school children with free textbooks. In Iowa, the majority of the public schools issue textbooks through a rental system. Kansas supplies textbooks for public school children on a rental basis. A supplemental law required school districts to provide free textbooks to students of poverty-level income and deemed unable to buy or rent textbooks. Iowa, Kansas, and North Dakota have not provided textbooks under the Title II program.

Region VII

In Region VII, Louisiana, New Mexico (for pupils under 18), Oklahoma, and Texas supply free textbooks for public school children. Free textbooks are provided for elementary public school children in Arkansas. The ESEA Title II program in Arkansas provided for the loan of textbooks to about 35,000 secondary school pupils.

Region VIII

Information on the provision of free textbooks by State or local school districts to public school children could not be obtained for Colorado, Idaho, Utah, or Wyoming. Free textbooks are furnished to public school children in Montana. Utah and Wyoming have provided textbooks with ESEA Title II materials. Utah utilized $55,864 to acquire 23,701 textbooks in the first 2 fiscal years of the program. In Wyoming, $1,696 was expended to provide 1,267 textbooks for the use of elementary and secondary school children.

Region IX

In Region IX, free textbooks are supplied to public school children in California, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Washington. Arizona and Oregon provide free textbooks for public elementary school children only. No information on free textbooks for public secondary school pupils in Oregon could be obtained,but in Arizona about 90,000 secondary school children do not have them. Neither State has utilized Title II funds to provide textbooks.

PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

The States and outlying areas participating in the Title II program are required to evaluate from time to time the criteria applied in deciding relative need to adjust their criteria and priorities. The continuing revision helps to assure the quality of instructional materials for all pupils and teachers.

Some States have made no immediate plans for changes in the Title II program. A number of States, however, have made adjustments in their relative-need formulas in order to reflect the needs of children and teachers more precisely and to give special consideration to the education of children from low-income families.

Delaware plans to concentrate efforts in the 1969 Title II program by providing (a) audiovisual materials in schools where these resources are less adequate than printed materials; (b) materials that meet needs of minority, ethnic, or racial groups; and (c) materials for early childhood education.

New York has already amended the Title II plan in a major effort to serve the educational needs of children from low-income families. The entire basic grant program will serve the needs of the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and pupils with special cultural and linguistic needs.

In FY 1969, Puerto Rico will use 31 percent of Title II funds to buy textbooks for children from low-income families. The effort of the Puerto Rico Department of Education is channeled to the development of an educational program that will equalize rural and urban teaching. The improvement of regional audiovisual centers will have top priority so as to give rural children greater opportunity.

Texas plans to establish a relative-need formula which will focus on programs for educationally disadvantaged children.

The number of special-purpose grants, made under the Title II program,which served children from low-income families has already been noted. Several States have planned to give special priority in this aspect of the Title II program to projects designed to meet the needs of poor children. Special-purpose grants in schools with high concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children benefit the children and teachers in the schools concerned and demonstrate the role of the media center in broad and rich instructional programs. They also serve in some instances as experimentation centers where new ideas in school media programs and services especially designed for the education of disadvantaged children can be tested.

Connecticut plans to implement a special-purpose grant program in FY 1969 and the educational needs of children from low-income families will be a consideration in the selection of projects. New Jersey hopes to fund a demonstration program in an urban school to serve as a model for a unified media program in inner city schools.

A number of States have begun to develop or have plans for developing lists of printed and audiovisual materials especially suited to the needs of educationally and culturally deprived children and materials which treat all ethnic groups with fairness. A special State committee in Maryland is now working on a recommended list of print and nonprint materials on Negro history and culture which will be distributed to all schools in the State. In North Carolina a bibliography on Negro culture is being compiled to accompany the curriculum guide which will be used statewide to integrate the study of Negro culture into the existing American history curriculum. Plans in Kentucky include the development of lists designed to meet the special needs of children from low-income families.

In Arizona under a partial Title I grant, a bibliography of instructional materials is being prepared which will be useful for all ethnic groups. Oregon issues a monthly newsletter listing selection aids to provide guidance for materials selection for various ethnic groups.

Plans are also underway to provide inservice training opportunities for school personnel working with children from low-income families. The Title II demonstration centers are available for school and lay personnel to observe superior media programs in schools serving educationally deprived children. In Rhode Island and Kentucky inservice workshops will again consider the problems and needs of disadvantaged children.

Oregon will direct inservice education to school personnel who work in migrant and bilingual programs.

SUMMARY

The ESEA Title II program has made a definite contribution toward providing poor children with increased quantities of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials. Formal and informal efforts have been made to assist teachers and media specialists to learn to select and use those materials most meaningful to educationally and economically deprived children. Special purpose grants under Title II have not only provided poor children and their teachers with needed materials,but have demonstrated for school and lay personnel media programs especially designed for the disadvantaged.

APPENDIX

Table I. Number of Children Participating in ESEA Title I and Those Also Benefiting from ESEA Title II, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968, by Region and State

State and Region	FY 1966		FY 1967		FY 1968
	Title I [1/]	Title II	Title I [2/]	Title II	Title II
TOTALS	8,249,900	6,927,198	8,997,830 [3/]	7,257,428	6,091,916
REGION I	170,600	164,628	263,970	206,298	215,487
Connecticut	44,700	41,000	71,950	41,000	41,000
Maine	32,400	32,400	44,060	44,060	40,208
Massachusetts	54,800	54,800	101,120	88,000	100,000
New Hampshire	8,400	8,400	11,250	6,341	6,910
Rhode Island	16,400	16,090	19,290	16,785	18,883
Vermont	13,900	11,938	16,300	10,112	8,486
REGION II	1,310,300	1,070,415	1,221,190	1,072,484	636,036
Delaware	10,000	9,549	12,940	10,278	15,970
New Jersey	105,400	105,400	120,770	120,770	-
New York	859,500	620,066	766,110	620,066	620,066
Pennsylvania	335,400	335,400	321,370	321,370	-
REGION III	1,446,100	1,244,000	1,720,860	1,472,776	1,270,592
Dist. of Col.	62,900	62,900	40,190	40,190	25,538
Kentucky	200,300	-	225,070	109,414	133,520
Maryland	93,600	93,600	108,360	108,360	56,536
North Carolina	332,400	332,400	387,460	290,595	243,683
Puerto Rico	532,600	532,600	673,080	651,097	661,315
Virginia	118,900	118,900	148,470	148,440	150,000
Virgin Islands	1,800	-	13,550	-	-
West Virginia	103,600	103,600	124,680	124,680	-
REGION IV	1,766,400	1,273,489	2,038,110	1,237,927	1,271,909
Alabama	427,300	411,592	483,110	398,535	619,631
Florida	170,300	*	252,650	*	*
Georgia	396,900	396,900	379,490	379,490	305,366
Mississippi	258,100	129,050	353,990	176,995	-
South Carolina	269,500	91,647	316,420	130,457	121,912
Tennessee	244,300	244,300	252,450	252,450	225,000
REGION V	1,081,800	832,117	1,066,160	791,366	633,742
Illinois	233,900	230,017	262,720	258,866	260,042
Indiana	132,100	128,100	172,600	137,000	123,700
Michigan	419,400	400,000	339,730	310,000	250,000
Ohio	221,900	-	205,100	-	-
Wisconsin	74,500	74,000	86,010	85,500	-
REGION VI	650,500	593,883	627,030	588,545	416,570
Iowa	87,500	87,500	99,770	99,770	-
Kansas	47,600	31,500	95,710	77,000	65,000
Minnesota	141,600	141,600	111,610	111,610	107,611
Missouri	250,500	240,000	212,060	202,000	188,000
Nebraska	42,600	40,470	48,220	45,809	35,035
North Dakota	38,800	11,813	24,460	18,356	20,924
South Dakota	41,900	41,000	35,200	34,000	-

Table I. Number of Children Participating in ESEA Title I and Those Also Benefiting from ESEA Title II, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968, by Region and State - Continued

State and Region	FY 1966		FY 1967		FY 1968
	Title I	Title II	Title I	Title II	Title II
REGION VII	969,200	969,200	1,130,250	995,824	1,090,453
Arkansas	171,400	171,400	147,810	147,810	168,515
Louisiana	139,600	139,600	256,990	205,962	235,239
New Mexico	54,800	54,800	66,850	57,784	76,585
Oklahoma	188,400	188,400	217,380	163,057	151,250
Texas	415,000	415,000	441,220	421,211	458,864
REGION VIII	158,000	144,745	166,910	155,809	95,636
Colorado	46,500	43,245	57,860	53,809	45,061
Idaho	48,800	48,800	58,420	58,420	15,831
Montana	30,000	20,000	21,150	14,100	11,214
Utah	17,000	17,000	15,740	15,740	16,880
Wyoming	15,700	15,700	13,740	13,740	6,650
REGION IX	697,000	634,721	763,350	736,399	461,491
Alaska	8,700	4,500	9,670	4,500	4,500
Arizona	126,300	126,300	149,110	149,110	295,000
California	291,500	278,583	379,920	372,146	-
Guam	4,900	4,900	14,440	14,440	7,550
Hawaii	23,100	21,000	19,800	17,388	12,045
Nevada	7,300	7,300	5,840	5,840	2,996
Oregon	66,100	52,138	56,180	50,655	29,400
Washington	156,400	130,000	102,320	102,320	110,000
T.Territory	12,700	10,000	26,070	20,000	-

* Not reported.

1/ Based on a statistical sample of 3,084 local education agencies. U.S. Office of Education. Statistical Report, FY 1966, The First Year of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. pp. 32-33.

2/ Based on a statistical sample of 3,352 local education agencies. U.S. Office of Education. Statistical Report, FY 1967, Title I/ Year II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. p. 12.

3/ Does not include 48,370 children who participated in Title I programs administered by the Department of the Interior.

4/ Comparable statistical data are not available for Title I for FY 1968. Title II data represent children participating in both programs, as reported by State departments of education.

NOTE. Although most ESEA Title I funds are apportioned on the basis of numbers of children from low-income families, participation in Title I programs is not limited to the economically deprived. Therefore, all children participating in both ESEA Titles I and II cannot necessarily be classified as "poor."

Table II. Percent of ESEA Title II Funds Distributed on a Per Capita Basis, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969, by Region and State

	Percent			
	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969
REGION I				
Connecticut	0	0	0	0
Maine	50	50	50	50
Massachusetts	50	45	25	25
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	50	50	50	50
Vermont	50	65	30	(1)
REGION II				
Delaware	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0	0
New York	50	50	50	0
Pennsylvania	50	50	50	50
REGION III				
Dist. of Col.	50	50	30	30
Kentucky	50	50	50	50
Maryland	24.5	26.9	25.9	0
North Carolina	51.31	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virginia	50	50	0	(1)
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	25	25
REGION IV				
Alabama	0	0	40	40
Florida	50	50	50	50
Georgia	40	40	40	40
Mississippi	47.5	47.5	47.5	47.5
South Carolina	50	50	50	50
Tennessee	50	52	54	50
REGION V				
Illinois	21	22	25	26
Indiana	0	0	0	0
Michigan	40	40	45	45
Ohio	40	40	40	40
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0

	Percent			
	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969
REGION VI				
Iowa	30	50	40	40
Kansas	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	20	20
South Dakota	50	40	40	0
REGION VII				
Arkansas	50	50	50	50
Louisiana	50	50	50	50
New Mexico	50	50	50	50
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0
Texas	50	50	50	50
REGION VIII				
Colorado	50	0	0	0
Idaho	55	50	50	50
Montana	50	50	50	50
Utah	45	25	25	25
Wyoming	(1)	50	50	50
REGION IX				
Alaska	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Arizona	9.74	9.85	10.75	10
California	0	0	0	0
Guam	25	25	25	25
Hawaii	0	0	0	0
Nevada	0	0	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0
Washington	45	47.5	47.5	47.5
T. Territory	50	50	50	(1)

(1) Not Reported

Table III. Amount of ESEA Title II Funds Used in Special-Purpose Grant Projects, Number of Grants Serving Poor Children, Number of Children Served by These Grants, and Amount of Special-Purpose Grant Funds Expended for Poor Children, Fiscal Years 1966, 1967, and 1968, by Region and State

	Total Amount of Special-Purpose Grants Under Title II			Number of Grants Serving Children from Low-Income Families			Number of Poor Children Served by Grants			Total Amount of Grants to Poor Children		
	1 FY 1966	2 FY 1967	3 FY 1968	4 FY 1966	5 FY 1967	6 FY 1968	7 FY 1966	8 FY 1967	9 FY 1968	10 FY 1966	11 FY 1967	12 FY 1968
REGION I	$42,000	$202,500	$380,000	5	8	21	535	2,715	4,150	$17,000	$9,500	$25,000
Connecticut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	25,000	50,000	95,000	2	2	11	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Massachusetts	-	137,500	265,000	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
New Hampshire	7,000	15,000	20,000	1	6	10	535	2,715	4,150	7,000	9,500	25,000
Rhode Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	10,000	-	-	2	-	-	(1)	-	-	10,000	-	-
REGION II	$971,986	$1,265,574	$1,302,396	18	31	27	152,897	154,458	153,029	$607,123	$637,483	$613,853
Delaware	52,040	44,900	43,570	12	19	14	246	1,807	378	30,240	60,600	36,970
New Jersey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New York	919,946	1,220,674	1,258,826	6	12	13	152,651	152,651	152,651	576,883	576,883	576,883
Pennsylvania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
REGION III	$447,396	$485,549	$617,665	21	33	56	18,643	12,502	37,738	$246,876	$208,715	$503,296
Dist. of Col.	-	-	24,000	0	0	2	0	0	1,600	0	0	24,000
Kentucky	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	187,020	275,550	169,500	2	5	8	1,207	3,987	10,286	14,000	50,050	104,500
North Carolina	75,000	149,999	224,167	6	16	37	3,192	4,815	25,352	47,500	98,665	174,798
Puerto Rico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	185,376	60,000	199,998	13	12	9	14,244	3,700	500	185,376	60,000	199,998
Virgin Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Virginia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
REGION IV	$184,420	$175,000	$337,799	14	4	10	36,434	18,869	82,559	$62,980	$60,000	$205,799
Alabama	-	-	137,799	-	-	5	-	-	58,896	-	-	137,799
Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	184,420	175,000	200,000	14	4	5	36,434	18,869	23,663	62,980	60,000	68,000
South Carolina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
REGION V	$1,658,054	$1,693,895	$1,547,786	74	84	143	390,017	318,866	390,042	$462,008	$516,490	$372,016
Illinois	620,000	758,000	800,000	56	74	89	230,017	258,866	260,042	115,008	116,490	104,016
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	400,000	400,000	185,000	8 E	10 E	4 E	150,000E	60,000E	80,000E	320,000	400,000	148,000
Ohio	611,054	535,895	412,786	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Wisconsin	27,000	0	150,000	10	0	50	10,000	0	50,000	27,000	0	120,000
REGION VI	$598,779	$769,044	$793,222	70	93	67	17,180	200,297	204,196	$363,371	$382,839	$425,139
Iowa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kansas	97,365	126,164	142,749	3	8	13	3,228	3,846	5,171	84,580	99,800	106,699
Minnesota	148,000	189,522	365,900	22	3	10	4,000	8,000	10,500	148,000	185,000	124,000
Missouri	261,909	300,258	105,098	39	48	11	7,874	10,548	1,364	39,286	45,039	15,765
Nebraska	82,706	80,300	127,105	2	2	4	1,231	1,896	3,139	82,706	90,300	127,105
North Dakota	8,799	6,200	8,800	4	18	25	847	4,013	4,446	8,799	6,300	8,000
South Dakota	-	66,600	43,570	-	14	4	-	171,994	179,576	-	66,600	43,570
REGION IX	$2,085,220	$2,125,486	$2,363,266	62	66	84	57,955	25,762	91,871	$1,532,120	$1,404,412	$1,944,394
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	13,029	76,296	8,556	6	24	2	14,000	7,000	500	-	-	-
California	2,000,000	2,000,000	$2,000,000	39	28	26	36,652	17,240	19,466	1,532,120	1,394,362	1,639,321
Guam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nevada	72,191	20,000	13,900	17	8	6	7,303	522	786	(1)	7,050	6,563
Oregon	-	29,190	49,000	-	6	13	-	1,000	15,000	-	3,000	6,700
Washington	-	-	291,810	-	-	37	-	-	56,119	-	-	291,810
T. Territory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Total	$5,987,855	$6,717,048	$7,342,134	264	319	408	673,661	733,469	963,585	$3,291,478	$3,219,439	$4,089,497

(1) Not Reported
E Estimated

NOTE: Regions VII and VIII not applicable